

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 6-15 are now pending. Claims 3-5 have been canceled. The limitations of claims 3 and 5 have been incorporated into claim 1.

Claims 1 and 6-15 stand rejected in the Office Action mailed August 30, 2006 on various grounds. Applicant has carefully considered the Office Action and associated comments therein and in response submits the following remarks.

As explained in the previous Response, Applicants' claimed invention is directed to a computerized method for generating and managing investment contracts. These investment contracts provide enhanced flexibility through the use of investor-selectable allocation parameters and response parameters linked to one or more investment asset categories. Although these investment contracts may be traded, the claimed system is not a trading system.

Claim 4 has been canceled. Claim 1 now includes the limitations of claims 3 and 5. Thus, the rejections of former claim 5 and the subsequent claims (which all depended from claim 5) are the only ones addressed in this Response.

The Office Action rejects claim 5 and the claims depending from it over Sanders and Shepherd, on the ground that each teaches the claimed template. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Sanders's "template" is an HTML template (see Sanders page 13, par. [0114]), which clearly has no relation to the template of claim 5 (now of claim 1).

Shepherd's "template" is an ordering party's table of future prices and probabilities of occurrence relative to a specific asset to be matched at the end of the contract to similar sets of one or more counterparties' prices and probabilities of occurrence for that asset. See Shepherd col. 2 and col. 5.

Shepherd says nothing about the requirements of the templates of claim 5 (now of claim 1), which are one or more specifications of a set of asset identifiers and corresponding allocation

and response parameters to be implemented currently upon the occurrence of a pre-specified set of conditions.

Since all pending claims require the templates described above, and neither Sanders nor Shepherd teaches or even remotely suggests such templates, the pending claims are respectfully asserted to be allowable.

No statements made herein are intended to reduce the scope of the claims beyond that dictated by the plain wording of the claims themselves. Arguments regarding claim limitations are intended to apply only to claims explicitly possessing those limitations.

No fee is believed to be due with this Response (other than the extension fee authorized above). However, if any fee is due, please charge that fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0310.

Dated: February 28, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Steven D. Underwood", is written over a horizontal line.

Steven D. Underwood
Reg. No. 47,205
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
101 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10178
Customer No. 09629
(212) 309-6196